THE
LIGHT OF TRUTH
— OR —
SIDDHANTA DEEPIKA.

A Monthly Journal Devoted to Religion, Philosophy, Literature, Science, &c.

***Commenced on the Queen's Commemoration Day*, 1897.**

VOL. II. } MADRAS, DECEMBER 1898. { No. 7.

TRANSLATIONS.

THE VEDA'NTA-S'UTRAS WITH S'RI'KANTHA BHA'SHYA.

(*Continued from page* 127.

Adhikarana 9.

Having thus incidentally shewn what sort of a person is qualified for Brahmavidyâ, the Sûtrakâra now proceeds with the main subject.

Because of trembling. (I. iii, 40.)

In the Katha-Vallîs, in the section treating of the thumb-sized Purusha, it is said as follows :

"Whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth (from the Brahman) trembles in the breath ; (it is) a great terror, the thunderbolt uplifted ; those who know it become immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the cause of trembling is the Paramesvara or some other being.

(*Pûrvpaksha*) :—Here the s'ruti speaks of the trembling of the whole universe by fear caused by the entity denoted by the word "breath". It is not right to say that the Parames'vara, who is so sweet-natured as to afford refuge to the whole universe and who is supremely gracious, is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe. Therefore, as the word 'thunderbolt' occurs here, it is the thunderbolt that is the cause of the trembling. Or, it is the vital air which is the cause of the trembling, because the word 'breath' occurs here. Since the vital air causes the motion of the body, this whole world which is the body as it were moves on account of the vital air. Then we can explain the passage "Whatever there is, the whole world, when gone forth (from the Brahman), trembles in the breath." Then, we can also explain the statement that "it is a great terror, the thunderbolt uplifted," inasmuch [as, like lightning, cloud and rain, the thunderbolt which is the source of great terror is produced by action of the air itself. It is also possible to attain immortality by a knowledge of the air, as the following s'ruti says :

"Air is everything itself, and air is all things together ; he who knows this conquers death."*

(*) Of cit. 6—2.

* Bri. up. 5—3—2.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing, we say that Paramesʹvara himself is the cause of the trembling. It is possible that, as the Ruler, Paramesʹvara is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe; and by the fear of His command all of us abstain from prohibited actions and engage in the prescribed duties; and it is by the fear of His command that Vâyu and others perform their respective duties, as may be learned from such passages as the following:—

"By fear of Him, Vâyu (the wind) blows."*

Though gracious in appearance, Paramesʹvara becomes awful as the Ruler (of all). Hence the sruti:

"Hence the King's face has to be awful!†

Wherefore as the Master, Iʹsʹvara Himself is the cause of the trembling of the whole universe.

Adhikarana 10.

This Adhikarana proceeds to shew that the Paramesʹvara, who has been mentioned as the object to be worshipped in the Dahara and so on, is the Being to be reached (by the liberated):

The Light (is Pbrabrahman) because we find (it so). (I. iii. 41).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya-Upanishad:

"That serene being, arising from this body, appears in its own form, as soon as it has approached the highest light. He is the highest person (Uttama—purusha)."

Here, a doubt arises as to whether the highest light said to be reached by the liberated is Paramesʹvara, or Nârâyana the Embodied.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—It being found that the highest light to be reached by the liberated is spoken of as the highest person, the *Uttama Purusha*, and the designation "*Uttama Purusha*' being a specific designation of Nârâyana, Nârâyana is the highest light to which the epithet Uttama-Purusha is here applied.

(*Siddhânta*):—As against the foregoing, we hold as follows: The highest light, here said to be reached by the liberated, is the Supreme Brahman called Paramasʹiva, it being found that those alone do not return who have reached Him. How can it be right that those who reach any other being than the Parabrahman have no return? Though specificially applied to Nârâyana, the epithet *Purushottama* is used to denote Brahman, who is above all Purushas, —all Jîvas. In the ritual of Brahmamedha, the word Purushottama is used as a synonym for Parabrahman who has to be reached. Wherefore the highest light here refers to Parabrhman Himself.

Adhikarana 11.

Aʹkasʹa (refers to Paramesʹvara), becasue of the mention of His being a distinct being, and so on. (I. iii. 42.)

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the Chhândogya—Upanishads and reads as follows:

"He who is called Aʹkâsʹa is the creator of name and form. That within which these are contained is Brahman, the Immortal. He is Aʹtman."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the "Aʹkâsʹa" spoken of as the creator of name and form is Paramesʹvara, or the Ether, or Jîva.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—Here "Aʹkâsʹa," refers to the Ether, since, by affording space for all beings to exist in, the Ether can be said to be the creator of name and form. Or, it may refer to Jîva, inasmuch as Jîva is declared to have some connection with the manifesting of name and form, in the following passage:

"In the form of this jîva, I will enter and make name and form manifest" †

As against the foregoing, we hold as follows:—Here, by the word, "Akâsʹa," it is the Paramesʹvara who is declared as the creator of name and form, because of the mention of immortality and other attributes of His. Indeed neither of jîva nor of the ether can immortality and the like be predicated. Wherefore, "Akâsʹa" refers to Paramesʹvara Himself.

(*Objection*):—Because of the unity declared in the passage "That thou art," Paramesʹvara is not a being distinct from the Pratyagâtman.

In answer, the Sütrakâra says:

(Because of His being declared) as distinct in sleep and death (I. iii. 43)

Paramesʹvara is a being distinct from jîva, because as conscious during sleep and death, He is declared

* Tait: up. 2—8.
† Taitt. Brâ. 3—8—23.

* Op-Cit 8—14—1.
† Chhâ 6-3-2.

to be distinct from jiva who, in those states, is devoid of all consciousness, both subjective and objective, in the following passages:

"Embraced by the intelligent A'tman, (the jîva) knows nothing that is without, nothing that is within" *

"Mounted by the intelligent A'tman, the jîva moves along groaning." †

It is He who is here spoken of as âkâs'a.

And because of the words such as "Master." (I iii 44.)

From the words such as "master" applied to the Intelligent embracing the jîva, it may be seen that He is distinct from the jîva. For, in the sequel, the scripture has the following:

"He is the ruler of all, the lord of all, the king of all. He does not become greater by good works, nor smaller by evil works. He is the lord of all, the King of all beings, the protector of all things."‡

From such passages as the following:

"Bow to the Lord of Cattle, to the Lord of trees,"§ it is clear that the Parames'vara is the Lord of the world; and nowhere do we find it said that jîva is the Lord of the universe. Wherefore, the being here spoken of as âkâs'a is the Parames'vara, distinct from jîva.

End of the Third Páda.

Fourth Páda.

Adhikarana. I

In the preceding Pâda were discussed such passages as contained clear and vague indications of Brahman. This Pâda proceeds to discuss certain passages which contain vague indications of Brahman.

If (you hold that) with some the inferential (is meant), (we say) no, because of reference to that which is included in the figure; and so the sruti says. (I. iv.1).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here is read by a school of the Kathas as follows:

"Beyond the senses (indriyas) there are the objects (arthas); beyond the objects there is the mind (manas); beyond the mind there is the intellect (Buddhi); the Great (Mahat) Atman is beyond the inlellect.

"Beyond the Great, there is the Avyakta; beyond the Avyakta there is Purusha, the supreme; beyond Purusha there is nothing; this is the limit, the supreme Goal." *

Here a doubt arises as to whether that which is spoken of as Avyakta beyond the Mahat is the Pradhâna of Kapila, or the body.

(*Pürvapaksha*):—It is the Pradhâna.—How?—For, Mahat, Avyakta, and Purusha are only known to us as treated of in the Sânkhya system of philosophy. As these are referred to here in the s'ruti, there is no occasion whatever to treat of the body. Therefore it is the Pradhâna of the Sânkhyas that is here spoken of.

Siddhánta maintains that the body is here spoken of; for in a preceding passage,—namely.

"Know A'tman to be sitting in the chariot, the body to be the chariot, the intellect (buddhi) the charioteer, and the mind (manas) the reins.

"The senses (indriyas) they call the horses, the objects of the senses their roads."†

A'tman, the body, etc., which are the means of upâsanâ (worship), are represented as the chariot, and the driver in the chariot, with a view to show that they are to be brought under control; and it is the body included in this figurative representation, still remaining unnoticed (after all else has been noticed),—that is referred to by the word Avyakta. Indeed in the verse quoted above,—beginning with "beyond the senses there are the objects," and ending with "this is the goal, the highest road,"—one thing is spoken of as superior to another with a view to show that each should be brought in subjection to the one that follows. This the sr'uti declares in the sequel as follows:

"A wise man should restrain speech in manas; he should restrain that (manas) in the A'tman which is knowledge; he should restrain the knowledge in A'tman, the Mahat; he should restrain that (mahat) in A'tman, the tranquil."‡

Therefore Avyakta here refers to the body.

---

* Bri. Up. 6-3-21.
† Ibid. 6-3-35.
*Bri. Up. 6-4-22.
†Taittiriya--Samhitâ 4-5-2.

* Katha-Upa. 3-10, 11.
* Ibid. 3-3, 4.
* Ibid 3—13.

(*Objection*):—By Avyakta, everybody understands Pradhâna. How can it refer here to the body ?

In answer, the sûtrakâra says :

The subtle, verily, (is the body) because of the capability for it. (I. iv. 2.)

"The subtle" means avyakta or unmanifested.—Being capable of manifesting itself as the body, the unmanifested or subtile form of the body, it may be rightly held, is spoken of as "avyakta,"

The sùtrakâra adduces another reason.

As subject to Him, everything serves its purpose. (I. iv. 3).

A'tman, the body, and all, serve their purpose, i.e, conduce to the fulfilment of worship, when subjected to Parames'vara. Parames'vara, the Inner Ruler, impels all including A'tman. As such, as thus forming an accessory of worship, He is spoken of as the finality of the principles to be brought under control; and as the Being to be ultimately reached, He is spoken of as "the supreme Goal." Therefore A'vyakta here means the body itself.

Because of the absence of all mention that it has to be known. (I. Iv. 4).

If the Pradhâna of the Sânkhyas be here referred to by the word ("avyakta," then It would have been mentioned as a thing worth knowing ; and there is nothing of the sort. Hence no reference to Kapila's Avyakta.

Now the Sûtrakâra proceeds to refute the objection that there is a mention made of the Pradhâna as worth knowing :

If (you urge that the sruti) speaks of (it as such) (we say) no ; for, by context, it is the Intelligent (I iv 5)

Objection :—The Pradhana, too, is spoken of as a thing worth knowing in a subsequent passage, which reads as follows :

"Having perceived that which is without sound, without touch, without form, without decay, without taste, eternal without end, beyond the Mahat, and unchangeable, one is freed from the jaws of death."*

Answer :—No, for, it is the Prâjna or the Intelligent that forms the subject of discourse, as may be seen from the following :

"One should restrain speech in the mind"† etc.

* Katha-up. 3-5.

† Ibid. 3-13.

Hence the "Avyakta" refers to the body.

The Sûtrakâra says that there is no occasion to speak of the Pradhâna :

And of three alone is this exposition and this question (i iv 6)

In this section, the question and the exposition are concerned with three things alone as worth knowing namely, the being to be worshipped, the worship, and the worshipper,——not with the Pradhâna. Their exposition is contained in the section beginning with the following passage :

"The wise who, by means of meditation on his A'tman, recognises the Ancient who is difficult to be seen, who has entered into the dark, who is hidden in the cave, who dwells in the abyss—as God, he indeed leaves joy and sorrow far behind."*

The question is contained in the following passages :

"There is that doubt, when a man is dead,—some saying, he is; others, he is not. This I should like to know, taught by thee ; this is the third of my boons."†

"That which thou seest beyond Dharma, and beyond A'dharma, neither cause nor effect, neither past nor future, tell me that."‡

Wherefore, "avyakta" is the body, not the Pradhâna, as it is a thing with which the present section is not concerned.

Moreover, there is yet another thing pointing to this conclusion, as the Sûtrakâra says :

And like the Mahat (I. iv. 7).

Just as, on account of the word "A'tman" in the passage "beyond Buddhi is Mahat, the A'tman," "*mahat*" cannot refer to the *mahat* technically so-called, so too, it may be concluded here that the word "Avyakta" cannot mean the Pradhâna.

Adhikarana.—2.

(*Objection*) :—Granted that there is no occasion here to speak of the Pradhâna, as the present section is not concerned with it. Elsewhere the Pradhâna itself is spoken of as the cause.

In answer, the sûtrakâra proceeds with this adhikarana :

* Ibid. 2-12.

† Ibid. 1-20.

For want of a distinguishing mark, unlike "Chamasa." (I. iv. 8).

The passage which forms the subject of discussion here occurs in the S'vetâs'vatara-Upanishad :

"There is one unborn being (female), red, white and black, uniform, but producing manifold offspiring. There is one unborn being (male) who loves her and lies by her ; there is another unborn being who leaves her, having enjoyed all pleasures."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the Prakriti which is spoken of as the cause of the whole universe and therefore as devoid of birth, is the one which the Sânkyas have assumed, or the Supreme Prakriti (of the Parames'vara).

(*Pûrvapaksha*) :—It is but right to say that it is the Prakriti assumed by the Sânkyas ; for, it is declared to be 'unborn,' devoid of birth, to be the cause of all creatures ; and we also find a reference to the three gunas indicated by the three colours, "red, white and black." We cannot hold that anything else can be of this nature.

(*Siddhánta*) :—It is not the Prakriti technically so-called that is here declared to be the cause. Indeed, by the mere mention of absence of birth, we cannot understand that that (Prakriti) alone is meant ; for there is no differentiating mark in the section, unlike the case of "Chamasa" in the passage "A vessel (chamasa) with aperture downwards" † which is followed by another sentence,—namely, "this (*chamasa*) is the head" ;—which indicates what particular kind of vessel is meant. For a word understood in its (generic) etymological sense to convey an idea of a particular thing requires some other word supplying a differentiating mark. Therefore it is not the Prakriti technically so called that is here meant.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to show what that Prakriti is which is distinct from the one technically so called:

Accordingly, indeed- some read by commencing with Light. (I. iv. 9).

"The Light" means Parames'vara. This 'unborn' Prakriti is rooted in the Parames'vara as the cause. Accordingly, some, namely the Taittirîyas, read the verse treating of the nature of the Prakriti, so as to declare that which is rooted in the Parames'vara as its cause. Having started with a description of Parames'vara in the words "subtler than the subtle, greater than the great," the upanishad speaks of the origin of the universe from Parames'vara in the words "From him emanate the seven prânas," and so on ; and it is while thus describing the universe as made up of him, that they read the verse (quoted above) beginning with "There is one unborn being." Because of this reference to him, it may be concluded that this unborn (Prakriti) is the one rooted in Parames'vara. Hence the untenability of the contention that the Prakriti technically so called is meant here.

(*Objection*) :—As caused by the Parames'vara, this Parakriti is declared to be an effect. How can such a thing be also described as unborn ?

In answer, the Sútrakâra says :

And because of the construction being taught there is no incongruity, as in the case of 'honey.' (I. iv. 10).

"Construction" means creation or emanation.—There is no incongruity whatever in the divine Prakriti being described both as unborn and as the effect caused by Parames'vara because of the creation taught in the following passage :

"That from which the maker (Mâyin) sends forth all this—the sacred verses, the offerings, the sacrifices, the penances, the past, the future, and all that the Vedas declare—in that the other is bound up through that Mâyâ. Know then Prakriti is Mâyà, and the great Lord the Mâyin."*

To explain : During the time of Pralaya, even the Mâyâ which is insentient (*achit*), though devoid of name and form, yet exists in a subtle form as the body of the Mahes'vara, and it may therefore be described as unborn ; and it is the effect caused Parames'vara, because it is invested with name and form at the time of creation. For instance, at the time of creation, A'ditya is the 'honey,' as the repository of the essence which the Vasus and other gods live upon ; he is, however, not an effect, inasmuch as he exists in such a very subtle from that he cannot be designated by any such word as 'honey,' as declared in the following passages in the *Madhuvidyâ* :

"The sun is indeed the honey of the Devas."†

"When from thence he has risen upwards, he neither rises nor sets. He is alone, standing in the centre."‡

* Svetasvatara-Up. 4—5.
† Brihadar-Up. 4-2.

* S've. Up. 4-9, 10.
† Chha. Up. 3-1.
‡ Ibid. 3-11.

Accordingly there is no incongriuty whatever in the Divine Prakriti being described both as unborn and as caused by Parames'vara. Wherefore the 'unborn' is not the Prakriti technically so called (by the Sânkhyas).

Adhikarana-3.

(*Objection*):—Elsewhere, again, the twenty-five principles (tattvas), established by the science (of Sankhya), are spoken of in the Sruti.

To prevent this supposition, the Sûtrakâra introduces a fresh Adhikarana:

No, despite the mention of the number; because of (their) being distinct and of excess.(I. iv. 11).

The following passage forms the subject of discussion here:

"Him in whom the five five-beings are established as well as the âkâsa, do I think to be A'tman; knowing the immortal Brahman, I am the immortal."*

Here a doubt arises as to whether the things referred to as the "five five-beings" denote the *Tattvas* of the Sânkhya system, or those spoken of in the s'ruti.

(*Pûrvapaksha*):—The number twenty-five being prominent in the Sânkhya system, and that number being mentioned here, the "five five—beings" undoubtedly refer to *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system, and to none else.

As against the foregoing we hold as follows: Despite the mention of the number twenty-five—obtained by multiplying five by five,—the technically so called tattvas are not meant here. We are given to understand that the things mentioned here are rooted in the Parames'vara who is referred to by the words "Him in whom." As such, they are distinct from the tattvas (of the Sânkhya system); and there is a mention of too many tattvas, owing to the separate mention of âkâsa. 'Mention of too many tattvas' means that the tattvas (here mentioned) are more than twenty five in number. Wherefore it does not follow that the twenty-five tattvas are here referred to. Neither can it be held that there is here any reference to the number twenty-five. The compound "five-beings"—*pancha-jana*—is a *sanjnâ* or specific designation, meaning that there are some beings (each of whom is) known as a *pancha-jana*; and five such beings are are here referred to, just as there are seven *saptarshis*.

* Bri. Up. 6-4-17.

Wherefore there is no room for the supposition that the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system are here mentioned.

What, then, are they? The sûtrakâra says:

Prana and others, from the remaining portion of the section. (I. iv. 12).

The "pancha-janas" refer to the five *indriyas* (including prana) as may be seen from what follows:

"Those who know the life (prana) of life, the eye of the eye, the ear of the ear, the food of the food, the mind of the mind,"* etc.

From this also it follows that the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya system are not meant here.

Again an explanation is given as follows:

By 'light,' accrding to some, in the absence of 'food.' (I. iv. 13).

'Some' refers to the *Kânvas*. In spite of the absence of the words "the food of the food" (in the Kânva recension), we may still understand that the five *pancha-janas*" refer to the *indriyas*, because of the word 'light' occurring in the opening passage which reads as follows:

"Him the gods worship as the light of lights."†

Having thus said that the Brahman is the light of lights, the illuminator of the illuminators, the s'ruti then speaks of the five *"pancha-janas."* By this we are given to understand that those lights refer to the five *indriyas*.

And because of the mention, as the cause in akasa etc., of what is specifically declared (I. iv. 14)

All such Vedantic passages as "the non-existent, verily, this at first was;" ‡ and "This verily was then undifferentiated,"§ not declaring specifically of what nature the cause is which underlies such emanations as the âkâsa, we understand that the cause (referred to) is what is declared specifically in the passage "Atman alone, verily, this at first was;" || but not the *Avyâkrita* or the *Undifferentiated* of the Sankhyas. So, too, we are to understand that the five *indriyas* specifically declared in other passages are here meant, but not the *tattvas* of the Sânkhyas.

The Sûtrakâra proceeds to show why the *tattvas* of the Sânkhya cannot be meant here:

A. MAH'ADEVA S'A'STRI, B. A.

(*To be Continued.*)

* Bri. Up. 6-4-18. (Mâdhyandian recension-)
† Ibid. 6-4-16.
‡ Taitti. up. 2-2-7.
§ Bri. up. 3-4-7.
|| Aitarey Upanishad 1-1.

SIVAGNANA SIDDHIAR
OF
ARUL NANDI SIVA CHARIAR.

(*Continued from page 106*)

PANCHARATRI'S STATEMENT.

Note.—[It may be distinctly understood that we do not want to open any sectarian controversy on the subject matter of this chapter. We would fain have omitted it altogether but it would spoil the completeness of the work under translation. This chapter closes the *Parapaksha*, and God willing, we would enter on the colossal work, composing the *Supaksham* of Siddhiar.]

1. *Mayan* (Vishnu) who is the Beginning, the Formless, the Indivisible, the omnipresent and the Wisdom-Light, took a form of his own free will, and from out of his just grace, slept in the midst of the vast ocean and gave out the Pancharatra Agamas ; so begins the Pancharatri his statement.

2. Producing Brahma from his navel and creating the worlds through him, and creating Hara to destroy these worlds and becoming Himself the Protector for such worlds, He is thus the author of creation, destruction and protection.

3. The Pancharatri states further that his Lord out of His great mercy has incarnated in this world as the Fish, the Tortoise, the Boar, the Man-Lion, and the Vamana, Parasurama, Rama and Balarama and Krishna and will incarnate still as Kalki and He is the God of Gods also.

4. Our Lord had borne the seven seas in his gill, (as the Fish) and the great mountain on his back (as the Tortoise) and discovered the earth which became submerged, (as the Boar), and split the body of Hiranya (as the Lion), and measured the three worlds (as Vamana) and became the king of kings (as the three Ramas) and had thus protected the earth by destroying the wiles of the Asuras. He will even become the Horse in future.

5. When that elephant was caught between the teeth of the crocodile and was unable to get home and cried out 'O my father, my Lord, O the first cause,' who else but our Lord whom we worship for our salvation, ran with rapid strides to his help and killed the fierce crocodile and gave Moksha to the elephant.

6. Our Lord of Illusive Powers churned the ocean and distributed the ambrosia to the Devas, destroyed the evil doing Asuras and protected the worlds, and gave out the true meaning of all the Shastras to his Bhaktas out of His grace, and thus became Supreme.

7. Our Mayan, is himself, the Maya, himself the Jiva, himself the product of Maya, himself the Maya that binds the mortals, and this Maya *bandham* cannot vanish except by his aid. Full of this conviction, if a man worships Mayan, his Maya will vanish and he will be taken into the Vaiguntam, by Mayan.

HIS REFUTATION.

1. If he was the Beginning, this beginning will have an end. So the Vedas say he has *neither* beginning nor end. If he is Light and Wisdom, then he cannot unite with Maya (darkness). If his body is formed of indestructible Intelligence, then it cannot be formed of the Subda-Datu.

2. That he possessed the elements of the human body (such as flesh, blood, &c) is evidenced from the episode of Sankara going and begging for sacrificial food. When Vishnu opened out his head, was it not his blood that flowed out and from loss of which he fainted and fell down. Our Lord raised him from his fit and he who slept on the waters walked behind Him.

3. If Hari can assume form of his mere will, then why did he not make good his own head, on that day when he went to eat at the great sacrifice and lost his head by the fearful act of Virabhadra. At the entreaty of his devotees our Lord gave back Narayana his head.

4. You said that Mal (Vishnu) gave out the Vedas and explained their meaning. Who but our Lord, taught the great truths from under the Banyan tree, when the whole world lay confused through ignorance of the Vedas. He it was who is the real author of the Vedas.

5. You said that Hari begot Ayan (Brahma). He was not able to create the (fifth) head af Brahma nipped off by Rudra. And is it not therefore false to assert that this Brahma begot Rudra. Understand therefore without mistake that all are Siva's acts.

6. You assert that he is God and incarnated of his own will to protect the world, him who was born like ordinary mortals from the wombs of a few individuals ! The Lotus-born Brahma unable to create, prayed to Hara, and the Lord of the Vedas burst forth from Brahma's forehead and taught him the act of creation

7. As Narayana begot Brahma and Brahma created Narayana, so each is the cause of the other. The first cause of both is the Lord who cleaved the body of the elephant-Asura, is asserted by the Veda. As such indeed, Vishnu and Brahma became merged on either side of Hara.

8. You said that the world is destroyed by the *FIAT* of Hari. But he cannot stay his own destruction which comes at the end of time; and the Relics of Vishnu's frequent deaths, are worn by Rudra. So too is destroyed the assertion that by the *fiat* of Hari every-thing is destroyed. The Destroying Siva, it is He, who also creates and developes the world.

9. You stated that Mayan protected the three worlds. He, to cleave the body of *Salandara* of whom he was afraid, prayed to our Lord for the Discus, and on obtaining it he killed the Asuras and protected the world and this episode is well-known everywhere. As such Sankara it is, that protects.

10. When Mal assuming the form of a fish carried the seven seas in its gill and threatened the whole world with destruction, presuming that he was the Lord of *Samharam*, the Lord of the trident speared the fish and severing the gill and eyes, put them on the trident as an ornament.

11. When Vishnu assuming the form of the tortoise bore the mountain Meru as a supporting piece of Rock he became puffed with pride and asserted that he was the support of the whole world. And the devas kept silent without supporting or repudiating his claim. And Hara, looking on, broke the tortoise open and put on the shell as an ornament.

12. As the Boar, he cleaved through the seven worlds and bore them on his tusk, and put himself forward as the only Adorable Light of the world. Then did the Lord who delights to dance in the Burial ground, tear out the boar's tusk, felling him down crying.

13. When Hiranya asked if Vishnu was in that pillar and struck it with his foot, Vishnu appeared as the man-lion and catching him cleaved his body and assumed the God. Then did Hara appear as the *Saraba* Bird and subdue the man-lion.

14. Begging for alms, and obtaining the three foot of earth, and taking the Heavens also, he took a mean advantage and imprisoned the giver Maha Bali. Such as he, cannot be the Lord. They are not the best of men who injure their benefactor.

15. You would make him as the Lord of Maya, him who not knowing the illusive deer as a deceitful creature, was caught in the toils of the Rakshasa and thus lost his wife. Becoming bewildered (from the loss of his wife), he went and killed the Rakshasa and to purge himself of the sin of killing, worshipped the divine Father (at Rameshwaram).

16. Parasu Rama, a devotee of Parameshwara, conquered all the race of kings, and for freedom from the consequent sins, he again performed austere penance and worshipped Parameswara. Bala Rama again stood in Yogic contemplation by meditating on Uma's Lord adored by the whole world.

17. When Maharishi Upamanyu bestowed his gracious look, on Vasudeva (Krishna) and touched his head with his hand and made him a vassal of Parameshwara, do you know that the said Vasudeva dedicated his body and soul and wealth to the service of his teacher and fell down and worshipped him.

18. You said that as a horse (Kalki) Vishnu will become incarnate in the future. If he does, we do not know what will befall him from our Isa. You have learnt what happened during the previous *avatara*. Nothing but the glory of the Lord whose crown is adorned with *konrai* (cassia) flowers did shine everywhere.

19. Simply because the elephant cried out 'O First Cause,' should God Vishnu be held therefore as such. When any one cries out "justice! justice! O king," does the King himself run up to him. This act of the Lord of Protection is like that of the City Magistrate who renders justice.

20. Besides, the elephant was a vassal of Vishnu, and if it called its master 'Adimulam,' the latter does not thereby become so. For instance, your own slave calls you 'my Lord,' and hence you are not to compare yourself to your Lord Vishnu.

J. M. NALLASWAMI PILLAI, B. A., B. L.

(*To be continued.*)

17. The Anueasana Parva of Mahabarat gives the full account of Lord Krishna's initiation.

19. Both derive their power from a Superior Power, which to all appearance is invisible and inscrutable and latent: but the moment the inferior power begins to misuse or abuse its authority, then will the Power of the King and Master be brought into certain play.

THAYUMANAVER'S POEMS.

(*Continued from page* 128.)

GOD-HEAD AS BLISS OF SHINING SPLENDOUR.

கொந்தவிழ் மலர்ச்சோலை நன்னீழல் வைகினுங்
குளிர்தீம் புனற்கையள்ளிக்
கொள்ளுகினு மந்நீ ரிடைத்திளைத் தாடினுங்
குளிர்சந்த வாடைமடவார்
வந்துலவு கின்றதென முன்றிலிடை யுலவவே
வசதிபெறு போதும்வெள்ளை
வட்டமதி பட்டப் பகற்போல நிலவுதர
மகிழ்போதும் வேலையமுதம்
விந்தைபெற வறுசுவையில் வந்ததென வமுதுண்ணும்
வேளையினு மாலைகந்தம்
வெள்ளிலை யடைக்காய் விரும்பிவேன் டியவண்ணம்
விளையாடி விழிதுயிலினும்
சந்ததமு நின்னருளை மறவா வரந்தந்து
தமியேனை ரக்ஷைபுரிவாய்
சர்வபரி பூரண வகண்டதத் துவமான
சச்சிதா னந்தசிவமே. (க௱௰)

110. O *Satchithananda Siva,* the undivided and indivisible *whole* extant in all! Grant Thou to me the blessing that I might not, even for a moment, let go from my memory Thy All-Graciousness: whether I remain under a cool-shaded grove of fragrant flowers; Or whether I drink fresh water of a most refreshing kind or take a good bath in it; whether I be gifted to walk at pleasure in a court-yard which diffuses the most delightful flavour of sandal-wood as if occupied by the accomplished damsels of exquisite taste and beauty who wear it; whether I enjoy with pleasure the bright moon-light; whether I take sumptuous food consisting of all six tastes and sweet as nectar of the *Sea.** or when, prior to sleep at night, I am engaged in a joyous sport garlanded with sweet smelling flowers, wearing pleasant smelling *Sandanam* and chewing the compound of the *areca* and cloves, of the betel pepper with chunam and lime.

O Universal Protector, do Thou receive me into Thy care.

தேசோமயானந்தம்.

மருமலர்ச் சோலைசெறி நன்னீழன் மலையாதி
மன்னுமுனி வர்க்கேவலாய்
மந்த்ரமா லிகைசொல்லு மியமநிய மாதியா
மார்க்கத்தி னின்றுகொண்டு
கருமருவு காயத்தை நிர்மலம தாகவே
கமலாச னாதிசோத்துக்
காலைப் பிடித்தனலை யம்மைகுண் டலியடிக்
கலைமதியி னூடுதாக்கி
உருகிவரு மமிர்தத்தை யுண்டுண் டுறங்காம
லுணர்வான விழியைநாடி
ஒன்றே டிரண்டெனுச் சமரச சொரூபசுக
முற்றிடவென் மனதின்வண்ணம்
திருவருண் முடிக்கவித் தேகமொடு காண்பனோ
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே. (ககக)

111. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the Indiscernible Sat that hast filled my heart! O for that day of my present life, when Thou wouldst make me be absorbed in the Peaceful Beatitude of Samarasa* Advaita Gnâna, *neither one nor two; which* I can experience indeed, if I be granted the opportuuity of serving under the *munis*† in the cool mountains of best shaded groves of fragrant flower-growths, and of practising the Siva Raja Yoga‡ of *Yama, Niyama &c.,* given in the Yoga sastra called *mantramalika* i e of purifying the body by taking the prescribed seat such as kamalasana and by pressing with the folded legs and arousing the lunar orb in the holy domain of *kundalini*§ and with the steadfast eyes, enjoying with great pleasure the delicious nectar produced thereby and the consequent bliss of sleepless eternity.

இப்பிறவி யென்னுமொ ரிருட்கடலின் மூழ்கிநா
னென்னுமொரு மகரவாய்ப்பட்
டிருவினை யெனுந்திரையி னெற்றுண்டு புற்புத
மெனக்கொங்கை வரிசைகாட்டுந்
துப்பிதழ் மடந்தையர் மயற்சண்ட மாருதச்
சுழல்வந்து வந்தடிப்பச்
சோராத வாசையாங் காலுறு வானதி
சுரந்ததென மேலுமார்ப்பக்
கைப்பரிசு காரர்போ லறிவான வங்கமுங்
கைவிட்டு மதிமயங்கிக்
கள்ளவங் கக்காலர் வருவரென் றஞ்சியே
கண்ணருவி காட்டுமெளியேன்

* c. f. Notes to 12th verse.

* *Samarasa.*—Lit. viewing all equally alike. This epithet fits this school better than other schools inasmuch as this school unlike the rest accomodates and assimilates all other *schools,* without any contradiction or strained construction of ideas or interpretation of srutis. c. f. verses 40 & 46.

* Munis are Rishis or ascetics.

† Vide Ashtanga Yoga (another name) under verse 61 and notes to Siva Raja Yoga under verse 62.

¶ Vide notes to verse 108 P. Kamalasana is the asana or seat or lotus seat (formed by allowing the feet to rest on the upper thighs,) There are nine kinds of seats (vide. 127th verse with notes.

செப்பரிய முத்தியாங் கரைசேர வுங்கருணை
செய்வையோ சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே. ௧௧௨)

112. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible *Sat* that hast filled my heart! Thou knowest that I am a helpless soul lamenting with tears like a boatman, losing sight of the ship of *Sivagnâna*, and struggling in a besotted state with fear of sea robbers the messengers of death; sunk in the deep ocean of this mundane life, seized by the shark of I-ness or Egotism, rolling with it in the waves of good and bad Karma and tremendously attacked by the storm of sexual love to the woman of blooming countenance with beautiful coral lips; and the rapid streams of increasing desires continually flow into the Ocean life in which I thus struggle.

O Benevolent Lord, do Thou render me the deed of mercy of enabling me to reach the blessed *sea-shore* of Siva-Sayujya-Mukti*

தந்தைதாய் தமர்தார மகவென்னு மிவையெலாஞ்
சந்தையிற் கூட்டமிதிலோ
சந்தேக மில்லைமணி மாடமா ளிகைமேடை
சதுரங்க சேனையுடனே
வந்ததோர் வாழ்வுமோ ரிந்த்ரஜா லக்கோலம்
வஞ்சனை பொறாமைலோபம்
வைத்தமன மாக்கிருமி சேர்ந்தமல பாண்டமோ
வாஞ்சனை யிலாதகனவே
எந்தநா ளுஞ்சரி யெனத்தேர்ந்து தேர்ந்துமே
யிரவுபக லில்லாவிடத்
தேகமாய் நின்றநின் னருள்வெள்ள மீதிலே
யானென்ப தறவுமூழ்கிச்
சிந்தைதான் றெளியாது சுழலும்வகை யென்கொலோ
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே. (௧௧௩)

113. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible *Sat* that hast filled my heart!

Our life is but a sham. The crowd of persons we would call *father. mother, kindred, wife* and *children* are in no manner better than those we shall meet in a market place. This is simple truth. And our happy living in richly ornamented houses and lofty palaces encircled with the four kinds of forces is a mere juggle; and our physical constitution is nothing but a wicked dream, being as it were an earthern vessel full of dirt and filth with the internal *manas* replete with *infidelity, envy* and *avarice*.

Nevertheless, O Lord, why should my mind be restless with sceptic and unsteady thoughts without *determining* itself ridden of I-ness into the sole boundlessness of Thy Grace, which is not limited by day and night and where alone does prevail the *Eternal* Beatitude, void of any unholy concerns of this life?

ஆடாம லோய்ந்திட்டபம்பரம் போல் விசை
யடங்கிமனம் வீழநேரே
யறியாமை யாகின்ற விருளகல விருளொளியு
மல்லா திருந்தவெளிபோல்
கோடா தெனைக்கண் டெனக்குணிறை சாந்தவெளி
கூடியின் பாதீ தமுங்
கூடினே ஞேசரியை கிரியையின் முயன்றுநெறி
கூடினே ஞேவல்லனியா
னீடாக வேயாறு வீட்டினி னிரம்பியே
யிலகிவளர் பிராணனென்னும்
இருநிதி யினைக்கட்டி யோகபர ஞகாம
லேழைக் குடும்பனாகித்
தேடா தழிக்கவொரு மதிவந்த தென்கொலோ
தேடரிய சத்தாகியென்
சித்தமிசை குடிகொண்ட வறிவான தெய்வமே
தேசோ மயானந்தமே (௧௧௪)

114. O Bliss of teeming Splendour, O The Supreme Intelligence, being the indiscernible Sat that hast filled my heart! Neither could I have the extremest Bliss of my Chittâkas being absorbed in advaita union with Thee the *Ever Bright Paramâkas*,* my mind being not yet tranquillized to the state of a steady top and consequently, my ignorance having not yet dissipated. Nor have I exerted myself in the Highest San-marga Sâdhana *Sariya, kiriya* &c. Nor did I, without extravagant indulgence enrich myself spiritually by procuring the great wealth called the *Yoga* † of restrainiug the prana that quite pervades all the six ‡ centres ‡ of my body.

But alas! I have had the imprudence of becoming a poor wretched soul to waste what I had with no further earnings.

O God I cannot know how I got this imperfectness

R. SHUNMUGA MUDALIAR.

(*To be Continued*).

* Vide notes under verses 41 and 108.

* Cf. verses 95 and 100 and notes. P. Vide notes to verse 108 The saint is narrating the course of a devout soul in the figure of speech of *anticlimax—viz*—First, the Highest Goal of Sivadvaita-saivam; Next, the Gnana Sadhana best conducive to the same; Thirdly, the excellence of the Yoga Sadhana included in the Second.

* The saint points out here by a figure that *Yoga* (in Tamil called யோகம் (Yogâm) which is colloquially used for 'good fortune' or good luck of a thriving individual in this world of *sâdhana*) is THE REAL WEALTH OF A MAN. Without Contemplation and bhakti on account of God, any man's wealth and fortune in this sâdhana world be simply thrown away or productive of evil consequences.

† Vide note to 'Sushimna' under 36th verse.

THE LIGHT OF TRUTH OR Siddhanta Deepika.

MADRAS, DECEMBER 1898.

Our afflicted Brethren.

Our heart sinks and we could not repress a tear as day after day we read of the ravages of the plague among our brothers and sisters in Bangalore. How they have suffered, and how much more in thought, the living more than the dead, and how many grim tragedies have been perpetrated, and how many harrowing pictures have been furnished! To the afflicted and those sore of heart, we extend our heart-felt sympathy, and our prayers are fervently offered to Him who once before raised His Hand to stay that of Death, to save his Loving child Markandeya.

***

Remember now.

We remember, when we were last in Bangalore, in a house where the hand of death had been felt on a very aged gentleman, telling our friends what we were to understand by this story of Markandeya. The teaching of this story is simply expressed by the scriptural text. "Remember now thy creator in the days of thy youth." The poet also has—

> " Be wise today; tis madness to defer.
> Next day the fatal precedent will plead;
> Thus on, till wisdom is pushed out of life.
> Procnastination is the thief of time—
> Year after year it steals, till all all fled
> And to the mercies of a moment leaves
> The vast concerns of an eternal scene.
> And why? because he thinks himself immortal
> All men think all men mortal but themselves.

We do not take time by the forelock and attend to our dearest necessity first. We think our religious salvation can wait. There is a time for all things and for thinking of Good in particular. When we are young and robust and strong and healthy, we do not think there is any necessity for thinking of God. Now is the time for the pursuit of wordly ambition and wealth and pleasure and Jollity and when the vigour of manhood ceases, when earthly pleasures begin to pall, and when old age comes, with pain and sorrow, then is the time we ordinarily turn our thoughts to God. But will such time ever come? Shall we ever reach this fancied time? What if we shall be cut off in the very midst of our youth and vigour, in the very midst of our ardent pursuit after power and pelf in the very midst of our enjoyment of love and pleasure? Where shall we be then? Shall we not have sacrificed in a few years of vain pursuit after transient pleasures, a whole life, and everlasting life and everlasting Bliss? Markandeya was doomed to death at 16 years of age. Well, no! Rather he acted on the firm conviction that *death was ever present, was always at hand.* "Time flies, death urges, knells call, Hell threatens, Heaven invites." *To over-come death, to gain ever-lasting life* (என்றும் பதினாறு வயது) one must work for his salvation at once and even now. And this Life and Love eternal can only be secured by ridding yourself of your self (அகப்பற்று & புறப்பற்று) and by blending your love and life in this other one, by worship of Him with all your heart and with all your soul, *even now* when your energies are fresh and intellects unclouded, and hearts untouched by sorrow and pain, and not when the eyes become dim, and speech begins to fail and the mind begins to wander and death is knocking at your door.

> கிழவருமாய் நோய்மூப்புக் கீழ்பட்டுக்காமத்
> துழவரும்போ யோயுமாகண்டோம்—மொழிதெரிய
> வாயினு விப்போதே மன்றினடமாடும்
> நாயனு ரென்றுரைப் போநாம்.

***

A text and its commentary.

The text is that of Saint Tirumular, that match less song.

> உரையற்ற தொன்றை யுரைசெய்யு மூமர்காள்,
> கரையற்ற தொன்றைக் கரைகாண லாகுமோ !
> திரையற்ற நீர்போல் சிந்தை தெளிவார்க்கு
> புரையற் றிருந்தான் புரிசடை யோனே.

> " O you dumb, who speak of the unspeakable,
> Can you reach the limits of the limit-less one?
> When like the waveless water, the soul attains calm
> Then will the Lord of the matted hair
> Shine in yon brightest."

And its commentary we extract from the 'Voices of a still night' appearing in the Nov. number of the '*Universal Brother hood.*'

" Keep thy soul at peace, as a still and quiet lake, that the depth of the skies may find its reflection in thee; and a flower of the shore see again in thee its vernal beauty; and that cloud boat travelling on the blue with its taut sails and hiding at times the sun; and that sun (Siva Surya) emerging from the cloud, shining so radient above the earth sweet and refreshed by the rain (*karuna mari*)

" Lull thy soul into the endless harmony with the sicelen of the world, which seems to buzz as a golden bee. That

which is Divine is reflected on thy wave, that which is earthly, lie on the bottom deep. When thou art still, the Radiance of Eternity (Anadi Jyotis) is burning upon thee; but when a stone of passion falls into thy waters, the blackness of thy deeps will appear, the blackness of the soil and mud."

***

Selfishness and Selflessness.

N. S.' writes to the *Universal Brother hood*:—"There is one word that expresses all good and one word that opposes it. The great all-powerful uplifting and up-building word is Love! It is Harmony! There is a light and warmth, a shadow and coolness, a joy and rest even in the word itself. There is a tumult and a calm, a combination of the forces that is indescribable.

"Love is rooted in eternity and its threads that focus in the present are so powerful that when the clouds and the corruptions of life are wiped away, revealing the natural self, that self is God-like."

"The opposing power and word is selfishness; all evil, meanness, and crime, all lust and worldliness are treaceable to selfishness as its cause. Ambition, jealousy, and the innumerable ills of life are the out-growth of selfishness. But this evil is a sham. It is on the outside. Behind all and underneath and rooted in the past is Love. Cover-ed up with rust and rot is the Divine Spark that we all worship! Underneath is the Beauty that fires love and devotion! In the heart of hearts is that Harmony of eternity, Love!

A kindly thought, a loving deed, is life giving and revivifies even a dying spark; it helps to burn away the dross, and lift the life one step nearer the desired end. We are always surrounded by affinities. If we will hold love in the heart, Brother-hood in the mind, and help with our hands, we shall be surrounded by Angels and a glorious golden light."

***

A caution.

The writer in the Watch Tower of last month's 'Theosophical Review' conveys a kindly warning and caution to Theosophic readers not to create authority out of conjecture and not to regard emphatic utterences as 'esoteric knowledge' which warning in our opinion has not been given too soon. For we have not unfrequently heard our brothers accept as the veriest Gospel, anything and everything which may appear in such a magazine, however wild and unsubstantiated the theory may be. He says "My guesses on various allegorical and mystical points of Zoroastriananism may be right or wrong but this much alone is certain, that they cannot be authoritative, for they are still mere hypotheses even for the writer......The world has suffered long enough from this publication of legend and sanctification of chance utteren ces. Are we modern students of Theosophy to continue this fully or are we to aid in turning the clear, steady light of common sense on the phantasies of the ages, and making these shadows flee away? Credulity in a false 'esotericism' is as bad as credulity in a false 'Science'—nay is worse, for it goes deeper within."

***

A very old error.

It is not for us to correct Scholars like Professors Monier Williams and Max Muller, but when such slips are for ever perpetuated and made the basis for other theories, then it is time, the correction is given. We refer to the mistake in the translation of the last sentence of the famous 'Nasadasad' Hymn in the Rig Veda. The last lines are usually translated thus.

He only
Who in the highest heaven sits, the omniscient Lord,
Assuredly knows all, or *haply knows he not*?

***

The last sentence is a suicidal one and we are glad to say this is not the correct translation or rendering. A more proper rendering is given in the translation of the same Hymn given at page 44, in that useful publication by the Society for the resuscitation of Indian Literature, *Vedas*.

"He who in the Highest Heaven is the Ruler of this Universe, does indeed know *but not another can possess that knowledge*."

We have already pointed out that Sat and Asat in this hymn is also not to be translated as ought and nought, but only as the seen and unseen Universe of matter.

THE THEOLOGICAL SITUATION IN INDIA.

We cannot do full justice in any review of it however full to that interesting and highly suggestive article which appeared from the pen of that talented Anglo-Indian statesman and Scholar who goes by the name of *Vamadeo Shastri*. It displays an amount of erudition and what is rare a deeper insight into the real feelings and thoughts of the people; and his observations are far truer than many we meet with in the writings of profound Oriental Scholars, and Indian Missionaries. The first observation which he makes is about the all-absorbing interest which is

evinced by an Indian in regard to the consideration of religious and metaphysical problems, and he states his conclusions in these happy words, "I am sure that a religion without any philosophy at all is no more stable than a house built on the edge of a great Indian river, which cuts away its banks or changes its course periodically." And the common mistake which an ordinary freigner commits is in supposing that no good can be found in the ordinary forms of religious beliefs prevailing in India except an endless series of superstitious rites and ceremonies, and when he has scoffed at these and answered to his own satisfaction what is supposed to be the philosophy of Hinduism, namely the Maya Theory of Sankara, he thinks he has under-mined Hinduism and he waits for the harvest, fondly hoping to see the old superstructure tumble and fall down into ruins. He is hardly aware that the two principal religions into which the whole Hindu population can be divided, Saivism and Vaishnavism, are each based on an old, very old philosophy, and variations in the forms of belief and rituals are not so real as the differences in the field of thought; and divisions and sub-divisions of these principal religions are also in the main due to ontological differences. The masses of the people have a religion which is all-sufficient unto them, which appeals to all their emotional, moral, and intellectual and historical susceptibilities and which as a learned theosophic lady truly observed combines both freedom of thought and rigidity of conduct. It must become more and more evident therefore as our learned '*Shastri*' points out that if this ancient citadel of religion and philosophy should come to be shaken, should come to lose its all-absorbing hold on the Indian mind, the cause should be looked for not in any foreign religion or religions, not in any reforming faiths in India but it should surely be found in the materializing tendencies of western education and western forms of Government. The education imparted by Government is wholly secular and non-religious; the standard of living furnished by western sojourners in this land, who live almost in gilded palaces and flower-festooned villas is simply fascinating; the administrative machinary is becoming more and more costly; and the improved ideas of sanitation forces on the people new wants, which all tend to increase the cost of living. And the excesses and vices of the west in regard to drink and food &c., are also obtaining a firmer and firmer grip on the land. And reformers preach too that unless you have a high standard of living you cannot rise in the scale of civilization. All these influences induce a spirit of utter indifferentism to religious topics, a greater quest after wealth and luxury, and the formation of a new school of political and social reformers. And it was olny the other day one of our respected countryman pointed out the great necessity that existed for counteracting such materialising tendencies by the starting of great educational institutions such as the central Hindu College of Benares.

No religion stable unless broad-based on philosophy.

Indian Religion undermined by Western Education and Western Forms of Government.

The writer next proceeds to show what various influences moral, physical and religious, are are being brought to bear upon him and what his attitude generally is towards the Christian religion and after stating the old proverb that history is like an old almanac and the same events and modes of thought recur, though at different seasons and in a changed order, he proceeds to instance the case of the rise of Christianity itself on the Mediterranean coast and from thence to draw the parallels in the present case and the contrasts. He is good enough to point out that it was from Asia that Europe has drawn whatever was profound, philosophical and transcendental in the western creeds and that India was the fountain-head of all the higher and deeper religious ideas which had always flowed from the East to the West; and that the chief strength of Christianity consisted in its being a well organised and perfected theological creed sanctioned and upheld by the union between church and state and enforcing its tenets and dogmas with both temporal and spiritual power; and he also points out elsewhere how this led to persecution, whereas in the case of the Hindu religion it was not possible. He also proves that Hindusim is a Religion and not a theology, and that we have cosmologies and theosophies but no dogmatic rulings upon such questions as are settled by the Christian creeds, the result of which is that whereas the Indian Religion and theosophy is elastic enough to change and adjust itself with the change of the advancing condition and stage of the individual, the Christian formulas and dogmas have become stereotyped and hardened, and the sacred history has become

Hitsory, an old Almanac.

West undebted to the East for its philosophy.

Hinduism a Religion, Christianity a theology

so immobile that no body can lay his hand on it to explain it away as the Hindu does with his sacred History (Puranas) giving it a new allegorical meaning and significance to such facts; and in consequence, Christian theology is under the disadvantage of coming into open conflict and contradiction with Science and Rationalism. The vivifying principle of Christianity is the securing of moral good, by setting forth authoritatively some powerful motives for conduct; and on the mistaken impression,—the one of the very few mistakes we could discover in the whole article—that the Hindu system of Religious thought has its citadel in tanscendantal idealism he says that the Hindu ethical sanctions are weak and ineffectual. Another more serious mistake which he makes is when he wishes to mark the sympathetic connection between increasing devotion to God Siva, and open commemoration of the Mahratta chief Sivaji. A writer like *Vamdeo shastri* should have known better of India, with its vast extent and geographical differences, and political variations in the past and before the British advent, when India was divided into so many hundreds of petty states and kingdoms at open war with each other. And we have the written opinion of a great Scholar in the western presidency that Saivism as understood in the South of India is utterly unknown in his presidency. And we may further bear testimony to the fact that the greatest preachers and writers we have to-day in the south would scorn to look upon questions of policy or Government with any concern, and they live the life of retired recluses than of public men. What obtains in one part of such a vast country and in one town, should not at all be applied or extended to any other place or town. By the way in P 692 he is good enough to notice our magazine, and pay a fitting compliment to our learned cuntributor Rev. Father G. Bartoli. And in the following passage, he nicely discriminates between the pursuit after higher and nobler spiritualism and yogic vision by the Hindu and the kind of spiritualism aimed at by his European brothers and sisters.

Hinduism not political.

Hindu and European Yoga.

"Or, if the longing to see further through the outer husk of the phenomenal world overpowers and enthrals him, he may clarify the oridinary sense perceptions by ascetic exercises, which give the power of discerning subtle evolutes of matter and spirit. I have heard that certain rudimentary indications of this latent faculty, which has course, been known to us for centuries, have latterly attracted notice in England, where some sort of group or sect of initiates has been formed for necromantic experiments. But it is said that, in accordance with the utilitarian complexion taken by all modern research, the chief object of this sect is to communicate with the ghosts of dead kinsfolk or national celebrities. In our country the cultivation of such abnormal faculties is the stock-in-trade of wizards and other wonder-workers, whom I by no means brand as impostors; though they take a very low degree in the occult science, and the true spiritualist rather disdains their acquaintance. It is at best a naturalistic art, directed towards the extension of our bodily faculties into a new region of experimental discovery; but we are no more disposed than are the Christian Churches to find any solace within the confines of sensational experience; for to accept such conclusions would be a confession of spiritual ignorance, the dishonouring servitude out of which we are perpetually striving to escape."

MODERN ORIENTAL SCHOLARSHIP.

The thick mist that once enveloped the past history of India has slowly been dispelled by the study of the ancient literary documents suddenly set on foot by a handful of European orientalists towards the close of the last century. Not only the ancient literature of India itself, but the immortal remains of the hoary Greek lore, nay, the history of the overthrown-kingdoms of Parthia, Media and Chaldea, were brought to bear upon the pages of Indian history. The history of India in those remote epochs when Greek philosophers took lessons from wandering Indian mendicants,* when the religion of Zoroaster was visibly influenced by the creed of the Brahmins, assumes a new meaning in the light of modern historical scholarship. The historian of India, the philosopher that would see in the life of the Indian peoples an immobile stagnation and the orientalist that observes behind the apparent incongruity of Indian religions a steady organic growth, are to be sought, by a strange irony of fate, in the same individual. When one dares come forward as a Sanskritist, he must needs be a sedulous student of Indian religions and a zealous arranger of Indian documents, to boot. Those are the complementary offices which, in combination, never fail to tire the attention of him that takes to the study of one of them. As we ponder over the exacting duties of a legitimate historian of India, we can not fail to think of hosts of "marketable" men who without any pretence whatsoever to a critical study of Indian languages, and sorely lacking genuine historical acumen, pose to write text-books of Indian History and memoirs on Ancient India by retailing second-hand knowledge under meretricious eloquence. To this band of men, historians like Elphinstone, Wheeler and Keene belong. A true historian of India, instinct with a love for Indian institutions, is yet to rise and competency for work is sure to be had when the harvest is ripe. When oriental research would have progressed to a fairly wide extent, when gladiatorial controversies had given place to settlement of solid facts, when noisy criticism results in leaving behind impeccable truths, there would be room for a historian to appear, and there would be facts for him to compare, collate and sift. In the midst of the sickening blare of trumpets in the dusty arena of presentday orientalists, when facts of Ethnology overturn theories of Philology, when a veteran student of Indian religions can not be convinced by the arguments of an Epigraphist, little work could be expected to be done by a conscientious historian of India. What can be done in the direction of history-writing with the present materials at an orientalist's disposal is best illustrated in Dr. Bhandarkar's "Early History of the Deccan" which, to say the least of it, is a dry-bone of dates and epigraphical results little animated by the true philosophy of history. Still we are not warranted in passing a malevolent criticism on such a noble work. The key to the whole secret of history-writing is less to be found in the individual capabilities of men than in the sufficiency of materials that inspires even an averge man to undertake the work. But though a real historian, under the present circumstances, can not be seen, it is not uncommon to find a stately doctor of Indian religions, or a learned lecturer on Dravidian languages or Aryan folklore. To measure the benifit that has been derived by oriental learning we have only to compare the amount of knowledge we possess at this moment respecting the Vedic, Brahminic and Buddhistic India with what Warren Hastings knew of it when he laid for good the foundation-stone of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. The latter event must remain memorable beyond everything else in the annals of Oriental Scholarship. The impetus which Warren Hastings gave to the study of Indian languages by the establishment of the said institution and the keen interest he personally took in oriental studies have resulted in nothing less than an actual revolution in the thought of the West during the last half-a-century.

The illustrious names of Sir William Jones, Charles Wilkins, and T. H. Colebrooke still live on the lips of many a distinguished Sanskritist. These were the men who were in every sense pioneers of Anglo-Sanskrit learning and their labours will not be forgotten till Sanskrit scholarship ceases continuing to hold its present all-absorbing sway. It is intensely interesting to study how their work in small beginnings has eventually, after a long course of persisting influence, led in our own day to the production of such mighty oracles of Sanskrit learning as Prof: Max Müller and Cowell, Roth and Böhtlingk. The rapid strides with which oriental learning has been progressing, and the signal triumphs it has achieved as a pure labour of love with many men, are best seen in the enthusiasm with which the field of Sanskrit

* See, *inter alia*, Max-Muller's *Psychological Religion* pp. 83*et seq.*

has in recent times been parcelled out by European and American labourers to specialise their sphere of work. Sir William Jones could scarcely have even dreamt of a day when men like Professors Keilhorn and Goldstücker should betake themselves to the study of Sanskrit grammar, when an authoritative scholar like Professor Max-Müller should confine his attention to the Rig-Veda, when Richard Garbe should take up only the Sankhya philosophy for his exclusive study. Nor is this all. The degree of specialization has gone very far up. Even branches of Sanskrit studies have been subdivided and subsections of these sub-divisions boast at present of their indefatigable students. It may seem scarcely credible for many to be told that the department of the Indian systems of lexicography has an eminent expounder in Th. Zachariæ of Halle, that the repelling region of Vedic phonetics is ruled over by Liebich of Breslau, that Bloomfield has lightened the trouble of many would-be students of the Atharva-veda which is even now a sealed book to the orthodox Brahmins, that Indian astrology, astronomy and mathematics are laboriously understood by Thibaut and Sanskrit medical works are explained by Jolly of Würzburg. Specialization is becoming more and more the rule and fashion of Sanskrit scholarship and there are unmistakable signs in the times that this spirit will strive more ardently on for ever. An idea can be gained to what length specialization has extended in this direction from the magnificent royal octavo volumes entitled the "Encyclopoedia of Indo-Aryan Research"* now being issued by a German book-seller under the editorship of the famous Dr. Bühler. Among the list of collaborators we find a glittering roll of names which ought to be a pleasing pride to the new conditions of Sanskrit scholarship. More might be said also of the storehouse of learning which is placed at the disposal of the cultured public in the gorgeous Clarendon Press serials entitled "The sacred books of the East" and edited by that modern wonder of oriental learning, Prof: Max Muller and in the "The sacred books of the Buddhists"† issued under the supervision of that same veteran Sanskrit scholar. We can also mention in this connection the rich "Indische Studien" of Prof: Weber, the "Trübner's Oriental Series" and the "Proceedings" and "Journals" of the various learned oriental societies founded in nearly all parts of the world. Of the latter, "the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal" with its branches, "the American Oriental Society" and the "German Oriental Society" deserve prominent mention. The movement exhibited in the starting of "The Harward Oriental Series"* reflects great credit on the taste of American Scholarship. It is an agreeable contrast for a modern student of Sanskrit who is literally bored by the stupifying din of recent industry and achievements to transfer himself in thought to those times when Sir William Jones and Charles Wilkins learnt their Sanskrit. At a time when the Brahmin Pundits had not shaken off their time-honored prejudices for instructing a *Mléchha* in their sacred lore, when English students of Sanskrit had to learn even their Sanskrit alphabet from the very Pundits whom in these days of enlightenment, none but an advanced European scholar of Sanskrit is able to converse with without the help of an interpreter, when, learners who were usually filling high offices in the Indian courts had to leave much of their stiff reserve before willing to sit at a Brahmin's feet, the hardship of those early English students could scarcely have of been of a light nature. Suffice it to say that both Sir William Jones and Charles Wilkins learnt their Sanskrit under Brahmin Pundits and they went home with their "Note-books" full of "meanings" and "explanations" to be, in due course, given to the world. The former published a translation of *Sakuntala* which took the European world by an agreeable surprise and the latter, a Sanskrit Grammer and a book on "Sanskrit Roots". Their views on the resources of Sanskrit language are of the same nature and each has nothing to say but homage to the universal excellence of Sanskrit Literature. To quote Sir William Jones, "The Sanskrit Language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more excellently refined than either"† He wrote a great deal in the pages of "the Asiatic Researches" and his style has a radiance and colour matched only by Prof: Wilson's later writings. Charles Wilkins' Grammar was in its own way a masterly product—we must not shut our eyes to the glaring truth that he was the first

*Nearly eleven volumes have now been published; Three are in course of rapid publication. The books are issued some in German and some in English.

† This is a new enterprise of Max Müller under the patronage of the King of Siam

* Till now, four volumes have been brought out. One of them is *Vignana Bhikshu's Sankhyapravachana Bhashya* edited by Dr. Garbe and printed in transliterated English characters.

† *Op. cit.* quoted in p. ix of the Preface to Wilkin's Sanskrit Grammar, (London 1808).

writer of a Sanskrit grammar for the European students, and hence ought to have experienced difficulties scarcely conceivable to us—which, without the serious troubles attendant on one bent upon mastering the indigenous works on Sanskrit grammar, enabled Bopp, one of the founders of the modern science of Comparative Philology, to become a profound Sanskrit grammarian. Bopp had not read even one Sanskrit work on grammar,* and yet, he was able, after a study of Wilkins' book to introduce his own epoch-making changes in the realm of Sanskrit Grammar. Every student of Sanskrit knows how much Bopp has simplified the principles regulating the declension of nouns† by classifying the case-terminations on a new basis altogether, and enunciating easily-understood rules to discriminate and apply them. Colebrook's interests lay in a different direction. He was not content with the study of Sanskrit grammar which was the one abiding passion for Wilkins, nor did he stop with reading Sanskrit dramas, lyrics and lawbooks in which Jones found intense delight. His extensive and reliable knowledge of Indian philosophy bore fruition in some of his most beautiful essays which are even now, after the lapse of nearly a century, looked up to as a clear and concise exposition of the Indian philosophical teachings. He studied many Sanskrit books bearing on mathematics including astronomy, and traces of this knowledge could be found in nearly all his writings. He wrote successively essays on the laws, the philosophies, the religions, manners and social customs, and "the Funeral Ceremonies" of the Hindus. To this day, what he has written on Sanskrit grammar holds its eminence for all the modern zeal of recent German scholarship. He was a man that worked his way with admirable patience and painstaking scrutiny, through the intricate labyrinth of Panini and other Sanskrit grammarians, and the unfinished fragment of his Sanskrit Grammar he has left to posterity is the best introduction now available anywhere to the study of indigenous grammars. To this period also belongs Johnson who translated *Hitopadesa*. The next great Sanskritist who was also a doctor of medicine, that had done capital service to the cause of Sanskrit scholarship was the memorable Professor H. H. Wilson. Alongside of Prof. Wilson we must not omit to think of the venerable Serampore missionaries, Carey and Marshman who, without doing prejudice to their primary duties as missionaries acquired a knowledge of Sanskrit which enabled them successively to publish dictionaries and translate Sanskrit classics besides writing books on the religion and social customs of the Indians which breathe a singular freedom from those malevolent representations, and venomous carpings which are the common hall-mark of missionaries' works on India. Instances are not wanting now-a-days of missionaries, without either the slightest respect for the dignity of their labour, or the least sense of regard for humanity which they are supposed to uplift and ennoble by the new religion they bring for its acceptance, writing books with no better purpose than to insult a religionist or to outrage the feelings of a friend of India. A smattering of Sanskrit, or worse still, a second-hand knowledge of Anglo-Sanskrit books read with little broad-mindedness is all the equipage the missionaries carry with them whenever they begin inflicting the reading public with their blatant gabble. Marshman and Carey were in all ways, noble servants of Christ, and their translation of Ramayana* and Carey's "Grammar of Sungskrit Language" and essays, are, though rare, read with intense interest by all students of Sanskrit. But the outstanding figure at this period, which could count among good Sanskritists, besides Marshman and Carey, Ward and many a good-hearted Missionary, people like Gorrieso, Julius Mohl, Schlegel and Fauche, is certainly Professor Wilson. Julius Mohl is justly illustrious no less for his oriental research than for whetting the appettite of many an earnest student of Sanskrit in the forties by assistance rendered in the shape of munificent donations for pursuing Sanskrit studies and by his personal example as a scholar. Gorrieso, Schlegel, and Fauche, by a strange concurrence of aims, had each of them worked at India's master-epic, the Ramayana, without the other knowing of it. As a result of this we had a splendid crop of new translations of the epic within a very short interval. Gorrieso brought out an excellent edition of Ramayan at the expense of Charles Albert, king of Sardinia. The text is printed in a style that can not be surpassed in any country for the almost regal magnificence of paper, printing, and get-up. He translated Ramayana into Italian

* Cf. Max-Muller: *Chips from a German Work-shop* vol. II pp. 25 *et seq.*

† See Monier Williams: *Sanskrit Manual* p. 16.

* For a sample of this translation, see Griffith's Ramayan Appendix B, pp. 507 *et. seq.*

"which" in the words of a discerning critic "may be equalled but not surpassed in any other of the languages of Europe. In his translation he has carefully preserved a Dantesque idiom and form of expression free from all local patois; his rendering is most faithful and his language elegant and spirited."* Schlegel published a Latin translation and Fauche, the most intrepid and indefatigable of translators from Sanskrit, has given to the world a highly-finished version into French. Professor Wilson whom it is nothing short of literary sacrilege to compare with other men of his time, was even a much greater figure than Colebrooke himself in combined knowledge of various branches of Sanskrit learning. He learnt in addition to what Colebrooke had already achieved for him, Hindu Music as treated in books (there is a story yet current among European orientalists that he was pronounced unfit by a Brahman songster to whom he applied for tuition in teaching singing) and studied Sanskrit books on medicine and surgery. His qualifications as a medical man rendered him eminently useful for this part of the task. The wealth of learning he acquired in India during his long stay, he has given to us in about three dozen volumes of royal octavo. His lectures on the "Theatre of the Hindus" and his vigorous, yet, literal translation of *Vishnu Purana* which preserves in a remarkable degree the devotional tinge of the original, are yet classics. He had a fine poetic vein and this served him in good stead whenever he translated Sanskrit books into English verse. His brilliant essays on almost every conceivable oriental subject are a treat in themselves for the general reader for abundant harmony of rhythm, for colour and movement, for energy and fragrance. His poetical translations of many dramas sound a chorus of ravishing music. As a triumph of the power which Professor Wilson possessed in suitably Englishing Sanskrit poems, we may look at his translation into verse of that delicate lyrico-pastoral of Kalidasa—*Meghasandesa*—which is unrivalled in preserving for us, the swing of tripping strength and the luxuriance of woodland associations the gentle perfume, the gay sheen and the chime of silver bells which ever are the reader's enjoyment when he sits to read the Sanskrit idyl. His version of *Meghasandesa* can only be compared to the delicious prose-version of Theocritus, Bion and Moschus from the pen of Andrew Lang. The pipings which we actually hear from the verdant alleys of a Persian garden on reading Edward FitzGerald's version of *Rubaiyat* of Omar Khayyam are those of another rare orientalist who is a born player on flute. Many people have attempted poetical versions of important Sanskrit classics, notably Mr. Griffith of Ramayana, Mr. Muir of many Sanskrit texts from Mahabharat and elsewhere, Mr. Tawney of Bhartrihari and Sir Edwin Arnold of Bhagavad Gita. In all these cases there is not the faintest echo of the melody of the original. The shackles of versification by which the translators are bound impede their progress and cripple their strength. What perhaps they might have done better in prose they did worst in wretched verse. Cacophony jostles in our ear and we are tempted to cast away the version and seek much pleasanter reading in the original. The fault never lies with the original, nor does it remain in the translator's knowledge of Sanskrit, it arises in his mistaking the pedestrian-like prosy verse which is little else but versified rhymes and bald prose, for fine poetry which alone can give melody. As a relief from these dissonances we can turn to Prof. Wilson's poetry which unites the rare qualities of silvery melody, fidelity to the original, and nervous expression. When Prof. Wilson, near whom we have tarried rather long was doing good work in England as professor of Sanskrit at the university of Oxford, Eug. Burnouf was lecturing in France. The lectures of the latter drew to Paris many students from various universities all over the continent. His name will live in the memory of all men as an industrious Vedic scholar, as the founder of the modern "Science of Religion," as an unearther of ancient Buddhistic books and as the translator of *Bhagavat Purana*. He was a master of nearly all the oriental languages and was chiefly remarkable for having introduced into the study of Sanskrit that spirit of critical research which characterises all the labours of the existing Sanskritists. He died when very young and he is always regarded as a marvellous genius considering his very brief life and his very extensive and profound oriental scholarship. Prof. Max Muller was a student for some time under this illustrious man, and learnt from him many of the virtues he now possesses as the bulwark of Sanskrit learning. Between Burnouf and Prof. Max Muller a few men might be noted. We may mention with emphasis the name of Thomson, the translator of *Bhagavad Gita*, Benfey, the author of a dictionary and a Sanskrit grammar and a painstaking contributor to

* *Op. Cit.* from Calcutta Review, Vol. XXIII, *The Ramayana*.

the etymology of Sanskrit language, Darmesteter, an authoritative scholar of Zend and a sympathetic expounder of the religion of the Parsis, Hillebrandt who has done much in the domain of oriental mythology and Whitney, a well-meaning but a down-trodden scholar who was more than once roundly snubbed by Prof. Max Muller for his hasty conclusions in the science of Sanskrit grammar. There are other names, not minor ones by any means, which we must omit for the present for want of space, names like those of Burnell and Goldstucker, Buhler and the rest. Prof. Max Muller's labours are too well-known to need any special enumeration. He is well received as a comparative philologist, as an authoritative and very useful Vedic scholar and an earnest and sympathetic student of world's religions. His notion of Christ's religion is coloured through and through with Vedantism, and his being prepared to recognise Christ as the *Pratyagatma* of the Indian philosophers, as the *Logos* of the Alexandrian School of thinkers, as the *Daimonion* of Socrates will be most unpalatable to the "Orthodox" divines.* His knowledge of many religions has widened his mental horizon and he is prepared to find nuggets of pure gold in all religious strata. To him " miracles" in the modern acceptation of the term is no longer necessary to heighten the value of any religious teaching.† To surround the founders of each religion with a half-mystic, half-spiritual halo is the birthright of humanity‡ and this, he says, is due to a disease that attacks the human mind in its transitional stage from a knowledge of the finite to a dim yearning after the Infinite in Nature. To him, as to Mohammad, the Sun rising everyday in the rosy east and flooding the heavens in a mellow effulgence of russet and silver is a greater miracle than all the "miracles" of Christianity put together. The *Siddhis* which the Yogis acquire are, with Max Muller, interesting studies in the pathology of the brain and nervous system and " Theosophical Mahatmas" and " Esoteric Buddhism" have little meaning and less foundation.§

According to Prof. Max Muller, if we have learnt to recognise the Christ in us, the Jivatma in our doings, the Logos in our life, we have learnt the best lesson which religion could teach. One step more and we find that Christ and God are one in essence, Jivatma and Paramata are only differences in degree. But the actual realization is not on this side of life but must be reserved for the activity beyond the grave. The so-called *Jivanmukta* state is merely a momentary mental rapture enjoyed, and not the real *summum bonum*. Not Prof. Max Muller alone has his views tinctured and his heart comforted by the study of Indian Philosophy, especially of the *Upanishads* and the *Vedanta*. Schopenhauer derived immense solace from the study of Upanishads and his philosophic creed was thoroughly permeated by the Upanishad doctrines. Prof. Duesson is another of modern men whom the balm of Vedanta has allayed and soothed when swayed by the pessimistic effects of recent science. He is a zealous propagandist of the Vedantic creed and an admirable student of all the European schools of thought. Not to speak of his solid additions to the modern " Science of Religion", Prof. Max Muller deserves the greatest praise in the interests of Sanskrit scholarship. He has been a tower of strength against the headlong innovations of modern men in interpreting old Sanskrit books, and chiefly instrumental in teaching European Sanskritists to elucidate Sanskrit texts according to traditional methods, and in persuading others to follow in the wake of native commentators in explaining Vedas and other ancient books, and not to desecrete the ancient documents coming down to us from times lost in the twilight of hoary antiquity, by laying the impious hands of rough-and-ready work. Sayana, he tells us, has solved many a real difficulty in the interpretation of Rig-Veda, and but for his assistance, the noisy clamour and despicable self-conceit of modern precipitate men would not have availed even one jot in unravelling the meaning of that venerable Aryan heirloom. His respect for native commentators finds a still more powerful expression in the writings of many of his pupils. Not only he is for following native authorities whenever there are difficulties in which it will be unsafe to venture on a desparate guess but he positively recommends the utility of reading Sanskrit books with the assistance of native Pundits. There are pitfalls in the study of ancient philosophy from which only the torchlight of traditional teaching will carry away one safe. Let us hear what his sometime pupil Dr. Keilhorn says in the introduction to his translation of Nagôjibhatta's *Paribhashendusekhara*. He remarks in allusion to the benifit of translating works of Sanskrit with the help of native Pundits, " It is

* Vide Max Muller's " Natural Religion " pp. 576 *et seq.* Also his " Theosophy or Psychological Religion " pp. 538 *et seq.*

† See Max Muller's Anthropological Religion, preface pp. ix. *et seq.*

‡ Vide Max Muller's physical Religion pp. 350 *et seq.*

§ M. M. Psychological Religion pp. 326 et seq.

sad to see the number of great Sastris distinguished no less for their humility and modesty than for learning and intelligence, diminish year after year, and to feel that with them there is dying away more and more of that traditional learning which we can so ill dispense with in the interpretation of the enigmatic works of Hindu antiquity, but it appears to me all the more to be the duty of both native and European Sanskrit scholars to save as much as can still be saved and to fix in writing what in less than half-a-century will otherwise be irreparable lost."* These are the words of a man that has at heart the welfare of Sanskrit scholarship and they will find a responsive echo in the feelings of many other friends of Sanskrit. We must mention one other man of note as a curious product of Oriental scholarship and that is Professor Weber. He is a scholar of considerable acumen and energy who seems to know no other mode of nourishing a talent or taste than by using it for malevolent purposes. A man of overweeing vanity and a rank hater of everything Indian, he wants to find in all the Indian products a subsoil of European influence. His rabid prejudices have evoked a great deal of censure from his fellow-labourers and he was more than twice violently cudgelled by Prof. Goldstucker. Very few of the living Sanskritists look upon his labours with an unsuspecting mind and the many ingenious theories he brought forward of Homer influencing Valmiki have been exploded by the late K. T. Telang. Yet we can not for all his blind prepossessions resist admiring his stupenduous *Indische studien*, a library in itself for learning and information. Monier Williams is his exact counterpart in England. He is the orthodox champion of missionaries among Sanskritists. His translation of *Sakuntala* has the rare stamp of having an oriental flavour. Weber's "History of Indian Literature" and William's "Indian Wisdom" have the singular merit of being the only books that give a connected survey of Sanskrit literature in a short compass, though the observations and reflections contained in them are open to much doubt and positive criticism. We can barely mention the names of Indian scholars who have been trained on European lines and who have had an Anglo-Sanskrit education. Men like Prof. Bhandarkar, the late Justice Telang, Dr. Rajendra Lal Mitter are easily brought under this division. There are others who without having an English education have caught the spirit of modern inquiry and tended to advance the cause of Sanskrit scholarship according to Western methods. Pundits like Taranatha, Maheschandra Nyayaratna, Rajaram Sastry Bodas, Durga Prasad belong to this class. The "Orthodox" scholarship has its ranks everyday thinning in numbers and that is not a very encouraging prospect for the modern Sanskritist, to whom its sympathy and assistance are of excellent use. Of the living Sanskritists Prof. Cowell is one of those who revere the indigenous learning. He has been chiefly devoting his attention to the post-vedic secular literature. His wife as it is well-known is one of the very few English women who have studied Sanskrit. Of Cowell's recent pupils Miss Ridding, an English lady, has come forward as the translator of Bana's greatest romance, *Kadambari*, a book which in point of difficulty of style, is rightly dreaded even by the Pundits. (Bana, by the way, be it remembered, was a PreRaphælite in Sanskrit Literature.) Of all the Sanskritists we have hitherto been mentioning there is little doubt that Prof. Max Muller is the prince. He has endeared himself to the hearts of the peoples of India by the manifest sympathy he feels for their institutions, the extreme good heart with which he has been striving to raise the level of excellence of Sanskrit scholarship and the open admiration with which he adores their great sages and philosophers.

V. V. RAMANAN.

*Op. Cit. pp. XXIV. *et seq*. Also cf. *inter alia* Macdonnel's edition of Max-Muller's Sanskrit Grammar, Preface pp. iv. *et seq*, and Introduction to Cowell's translation of Sandilya Sutra, *Bibliotheca Indica Series*, pp. *V. et Seq*.

REVIEWS.

Ancient Tamilian Civilization.—'S. S.' contributes an article to the '*Indian Social Reformer*' of the 4th instant on 'South Indian Civilization' Of course, he would not drop this cumbrous phrase nor the inappropriate word 'Dravidian'; neither would he condescend to mention our name, though he is good enough to accept our theory and he observes, "So, it is probable that *the Dravidians might have landed in Southern India by sea,* (as some think), settled there and gradually spread towards the north, long before the Aryans came to India." He discounts the idea also that the Brahmans were the pioneers of civilization in the south and remarks that there are ample and clear proofs to show that the Dravidians were highly developed in their civilization long before the advent of the Brahmans to the south. He refers to the independence of the language, literature and architecture and religion and art of the Tamilians in proof of its separate origin. He derives Tamil from the root 'தமிழ்' meaning 'independent,' but this is more fanciful than real, though it has the sanction of such a veteran Scholar as Mr. C. W. Damodaram Pillai. He would derive also the Adi Siva Gurukals from the ancient Tamilians also, but the arguments he adduces, in the matter of intermarriage and interdining, are not conclusive, as other sections of Brahmins, and even subsections do not interdine and intermarry; and Sankaracharya had also introduced an element of conflict by denouncing the old true Agamic worship, chiefly by reason of his difference with the true and old philosophy with which that worship was connected. 'S. S.' concludes, 'From these facts it may be maintained that the Dravidians were originally an independent civilized nation, and imparted to the Aryans more than what they derived from them, in point of civilization.'

———

'**The Upanishad Artha Deepika**'.—We heartily welcome this new monthly magazine projected by Mr. A. Siva Row, Sub Registrar of Kuttalam, in which he purposes to translate the principal Upanishads into Tamil with Advaita, Dvaita and Vishishtadvaita Bashiyas. And the first instalment of the w[illegible] is very promising and we earnestly hope he would succeed in his attempt. What we would however ask him to do, if he would kindly adopt our suggestion, is, to give first of all, a true and literal translation of the Sanscrit Text in the பதவுரை, untrammelled by any of the interpretations put on it by commentators and untrammelled by their peculiar terminology taking care that he does not leave this duty to be performed by his pandit friends. The special views of different commentators can be given in the foot notes. The commentaries more often clog our intellects than help us to their real solution. The peculiar thing about these commentaries we may mention. Sankara and his followers would always interpret such words as Isa, Iswara, Maheswara and Parameshwara, Isana, &c, to mean wherever they occur in the Upanishads as Atma; and the Vaishnavite commentator tries very hard to make out that they can mean only Narayana and nothing else? Don't these words convey such meanings as they appear ordinarily? Of course they are quite conscious that that is not the traditional interpretation (ருடியார்த்தம்) of the words and the sense in which it is used is not the sense which they want to introduce into the word. They resort to its literal acceptation, (யோகார்த்தம்) to exlpain away their particular divergences. If the word only means Narayana, the first word of the very first Upanishad could begin with 'Narayana' than with 'Isa' and the commentator in page 25 admits that the ordinary rule of interpretation is that where a word has a particular meaning in common usage and also a literal meaning, the traditional meaning is the one to be accepted. Of course we would be glad to meet some Isa or Ishwara Iyengar or Achariar or Parameshwara Iyengar.

One thing more. We do not approve of the text being given in Devanagari. It will prove of no use to the ordinary Tamil man. And we do not acknowledge the high merit and great antiquity claimed for it by Mr. Siva Row. They were later than Tamil or Grantha characters and had a southern origin. He can maintain his position if he derives the Pranava Symbol ஓ (உ) Pillayar shuli from the Devanagari instead of from the Tamil.

———

EXTRACT.

THE POETS OF THE TAMIL LANDS.

By the Rev. G. U. Pope, M.A.; D.D.
(*Balliol College and Indian Institute, Oxford*)

VI. THE NALADI NANNURRU, OR 400 QUATRAINS, AND THE LATER TAMIL GNOMIC POETRY.

Continued from page 143.

§ 4. The "Three Spices": Tirikadugam.

Tirikadugam is from Sanskrit, and means *composed of three spices.* These spices are dry ginger, long pepper, and black pepper, and form a very popular stimulating and restorative medicine. Here each stanza, of which there are 100, introduces three things for comparison, contrast, or illustration. It is a fascinating though very fantastic little cento.

The reputed author is *Nallathanar*, mentioned as a member of the Madura College, of whom nothing is really known. It is impossible to assign an earlier date to this work as a whole than the fifteenth century, though many lines are exceedingly ancient.

Parallels to most of the verses will be found in Bohtlingk's Sanskrit Analecta.

Youth is by nature apt to slide away from right;
Folly is mighty to utter things forbidden;
And evermore
Meanness indulges in angry passions!—
These three the wise will shun. (14.)

The man undisciplined who raves, and thus his cause would win
The man who eagerly desires what cannot be;
From mere report
Who finds fault with others' learning;
These three beat chaff in a mortar! (28.)

"Self conciet and extolling one's self;
Anger fostered, and not suppressed;
And meanness
That covets the possessions of others; these three
Are instruments that destroy fortune." (38.)

A horse not well broken in to his paces;
An elephant that breaks the post to which he is tied;
And the school
Of him who grows angry while he teaches;
These three the wise will ever shun. (46.)

Acquire wealth in order to give; in virtue's way
That you may walk study great works;
With gracious purpose
Speak thou each word: these three paths
Conduct not to the dark and painful world. (90.)

To speak thoughtlessly about life while it is enjoyed;
To say *we've lost it*, when the end is nigh;
And to feel shame (for sins) when disease comes and the body fails:
These three are characteristics of short-lived mortals, (91,)

§ 5. "The Five Precious Perfumes": Elathi.

The name is Sanskrit. The five are (1) "cardamom" = a perfumed confection of cardamom seeds; (2) "camphor"; (3) *Erikasu*, "an odorous wood"; (4) "sandalwood paste"; and (5) "honey."

This mingling of perfumes is used for the hair. This title is given to a collection of 81 gnomic verses in which each quatrain is supposed to combine, compare, and illustrate five (or six) things.

The work is of Jain origin. Its author's name is *Kanimethaiyar* (= "he whose knowledge is appreciated (by all)"). It is one of the eighteen lesser classics: *Sanga-seyyul.* Of the author nothing is really known, except that he is styled a disciple of Makkayanar, a learned *asiriyar*, or pandit, one of the Madura Academy. It is probably not of much later date than the *Naladi* itself; and is once quoted by the Commentator on the Jivaga Chintamani. The Madras edition of 1887 is here referred to. There is a very useful commentary. Perhaps a careful study of *Elathi* will more than that of any other minor poet, help the learner to understand the *Naladi*, and the whole body of Tamil didactic verse. We give a few specimens.

"Sages of gentle soul have laid it down, enlarging on the theme, that six qualities belong to loving souls: (1) neither survives the other, (2) they share their wealth, (3) they hold sweet intercourse of speech, (4) they joy to meet, (5) share one another's pain, (6) and grieve to part." (69.)

"To die is easy; to attain perfection hard!
To desire good is easy; to put on truth hard!
To set out in pursuit of the right is easy; to be steadfast hard!
To gain triumphs as accomplished scholars easy; hard to reach heaven!" (40.)

"Thou whose dark eye is beautiful and wide!
O swan in form! Who feel the truth will speak
The truth alway!
Lying, slander, harsh words and useless words—these four
From lips of fools alone proceed." (29)

The following contains a striking description of the goal reached by the sage:

Heaven.

"If one would tell of the excellence of the pure and loftly goal which sages from falsehood free have sought out and desired as the only reality; (in that place) there is no light that dispels darkness' no speech, no change, no weariness, no suffering, no sweet sleep. (67.)

(*No light, since no darkness: no words; no increase or diminution of joy; . . . no sweetness of repose, because no toil.*)

The Perishable and Imperishable.

"Youth passes swiftly away, disease and eld draw nigh
Bright flowers of wealth and strength fade fast.
[illegible]e life is thine, desire thou not earth's gifts,
[illegible]ou whose words as milk are sweet!)
[illegible]ire release.—The law is this." (22.)

(A finished verse in Tamil.)

Sympathy is noble Courtesy.

"When death, or loss, or hate, or griefs, or joys,
Or foolish babble of the people's tongues,

Befall one's friends,—
To feel with them, and share their joys and griefs,
This is in truth the noblest COURTESY." (80.)

DEATH.

"He fears not sword: dreads not bravery: respects not beauty shrinks not from any hero; is not dismayed by any assemblage of resources; fails not his day:—therefore, if you see death's coming, imminent, betake yourself to the studies that relate to *release*. (23.)

"He goes not away though one weep; he knows no dread; if one lament aloud he hears not; if one spring up he does not relinquish his hold; he does not depart, saying, *these are helpless ones*: though one pay him reverence he goes not! Why do men not ponder *death's* power, and labour in works of penitential expiation? To remain idle is surely a fault!" (38.)

§ 6. NANNERRI—" THE GOOD WAY."

This consists of forty quatrains by Siva-piragasa suvami of Turraimangalam. He was a Saivite Guru. They are printed in "Minor Poets," and separately. These though comparatively modern (seventeenth century) are classical and of great value. Every verse has its apt, and often very ingenious simile.

The whole would well bear translation. We give four.

"The great wealth of those who render no assistance to others
Shall become the possession of those who render such help!
Thus the mighty sea
Whose accumulated waters render aid to none,*
The cloud shall drink up, and pour in rain upon the world." (35)
The excellent think not of their own wants
But supply the wants of others!
Thus the moon
Seeks not to remove the stain of its own spots,
But chases the darkness that spreads over the world. (39.)

In the wide ocean-girt world delight thou
In pleasnt words, and not in harsh ones!
Damsel with golden bracelets!
The sea rises not up to meet the sun's fierce fiery rays,
But rises at the bidding of the cool-rayed moon. (40.)
The friendship of the good will daily increase in sweetness;
Others' friendship will ever more and more become worthless!
Hear, O beloved!
If the tender fruit ripen, it becomes sweet to the taste;
If the twig grow mature what pleasure's there? (51.)

§ 7. SIRRU-PANJA-MULAM.

This is a collection in which five things are compared, and from this fact it gets its name, which really signifies "the collection of fivefold analogies." It is not very much in use, but is like the others emarkable for terse graceful expression of quite common place or obvious ideas; but to give to homely pleasant thoughts such form and expression as shall make them dear to successive generations, to all classes, and to every age, is a distingnished merit, and these quatrains possess it. We shall give a few specimens only. The Tamil scholar will doubtless find easy access to good editions with commentary.

* It quenches no man's thirst, and invigorates no man's field.

GAINS.

"The learned man will gain gold.
The gain of good verse is its meaning.
What gain is there from disputation?
What gain from the musical instrument which a man has not beforehand learn to use?
When the unlearned seek the society of the learned their gain is derision!"

AMBROSIA.

"A chaste wife is ambrosia.
A learned man of disciplined mind is ambrosia.
A country well taught is ambrosia.
To a country whose banners reach the clouds the king is ambrosia. And *the servant that does his duty is ambrosia!*"

RUIN.

Forgetfulness is ruin; the pride of wealth is ruin;
Immaturity is ruin; so is obstinacy;
To be at variance with his labourers is always ruin to the cultivator!

BEAUTY.

"The beauty of the eye is benevolence;
The beauty of the leg is firmness;
The beauty of calculation is correct numbering;
The beauty of music is its charm for the ear;
The beauty of the king is the prosperity of his land."

"The beauty of wavy locks, the beauty of rounded form,
The beauty of nails and ears,
The beauty of the teeth, these are not real beauty.
To speak as true wisdom teaches is beauty."

§ 8. "THINGS SWEET AND BITTER."

There are forty Tamil quatrains in which are enumerated the things that are supposed to yield abiding "pleasure" to men; and forty in which are given those things which on the contrary cause "pain." These verses are not of any particular merit, but are constantly quoted. The author is said to be by an old Madura sage named *Senthanar*, but nothtng is really known as to their origin. They are quite classical in style. We give a specimen of each.

GARDENING.

Let pleasant words be the fertile soil, benevolence the seed,
Weed out harsh words, add manure of truthfulness,
Water the crop with love, and so cultivate
The tender herb of virtue from thine earliest days.

LOVE.

Right pleasant is life with those with whom we are at one;
Pleasant to see the full moon in the wide fields of heaven;
But to be unblameable in deed, and with a tender soul
To be loving unto all is truly sweet. (4.)

The weapon wielded by a powerless arm is nought;
The beauty of a flower no fragrance breathes is nought;
The resolution of the man without clear knowledge is nought;
And so the speech of him who knows not use of words!

The desire of the destitute to do benevolent deeds is vain;
To dwell in a city of palaces to the poor man is vain;
To feast upon the mere sight of a cookhouse is vain;
Friendship of those who desert you in adversity is vain!

§ 9. "OLD WORDS": *Para-mori.*

Under this title a number of quatrains exist which are of considerable interest, and are founded on actual proverbs. From this the collection takes its title. In our account of the *Naladi* it will be seen that two collections of verses were supposed to have been preserved with that work, though they reached the bank at different places (See Introduction, p. ix). Their actual antiquity is perhaps doubtful, but their value and classical character cannot be questioned. We subjoin a few specimens.

When our friends speak in our praise it is well
To ignore the soft words, and disclaim the praise.
Lord of the Hill where bamboos wave;
Men put not on jewels that become them not,
Even though the jewles are their own!

When worthless people chatter senseless things
'Tis hard to stop their tongues.
Lord of the shore,
Where ships are seen reeling like drunken men!
There are none who can tie up the winds.

When a man possesses wealth and worldly greatness,
If he be not of a truly disciplined mind,
The exaltation of such an ignoble person
Is like *putting a torch iuto a monkey's hand.*

The silly man who speaks evil words, and hides his malice,
Will bring himself to grief by his speech,
O lovely maid!
The frog hides himself in the sand, and lies concealed,—
But by his croak he betrayes himself.

Wealth that knows no sum, high birth, all kingly adjuncts,
And to be named as worthy by the king,
Are not great things. Here and hereafter
To possess one's self is greatness!

Those who passess stores of rare wealth
Need not to seek men to perform their behests.
Lord of the land
Where the heron sleeps on the buffalo's shoulder!
When you've dug a tank you need not seek for frogs.

§ 10. "THE ESSENCE OF THE WAY OF VIRTUE": *Arra-nerri Saram.*

This is a small collection that like "Old Words" is reputed to have escaped the flood with the Naladi. It is like the former, but not quite so proverbial in character.

PROCRASTINATION.

"The men of excellence will say we will perform
Deeds of virtue betimes, and do them thoroughly.
At eventide
Man lays him down, never to rise again!—
Why do men not perform virtuous deeds betimes?"

Soul! I cannot gain entire power
Over thee; whom then can I rule?
On earth if I gain control of thee,
I have the key that opens heaven.

MONKS AND MEN.

If they abide amidst their fellow men yet rule their souls,
They are as virtuous as those who live in thickets
Where wild flowers bloom.
And in those wilds who dwelling govern not their soul,
Are as those that dwell in midmost of the town!

The housewife beloved, and one'self—
The two together yoked,—must draw the car!
By one alone
The chariot of domestic virtue pure
Onward rolls not, but standeth still.

From day to day though it lie in the water,
The stone rarely becomes softened.
Like that stone
Base men from day to day hear virtuous teaching,
But their hearts are harder than the stone.

§ 11. NITI-NERRI-VILAKKAM: *A lamp in the way of right.*"

Passing over an immense number of minor poets, I must add some mention of a work of purely native origin which within the last two hundred years has been added to the undoubted classics of the language. It is the *Niti-nerri-vilakkam*—" The lamp in the path of righteousness." An edition of this has been published by an admirable Tamil scholar, the late Henry Stokes, Esq., of the Madras Civil Service.The work consists of 102 quatrains, and is every way admirable; but it would require a chapter by itself, The date is about 1700 A. D.

This gives his idea of mysticism:

"Nought doubting, wav'ring not sages explore by reason's aid
Till all grows clear; with eye of apprehension true op'd wide.
They sleep, and see the vision clear.* In that pure mystic light
When waking life arrays itself, 'tis being's perfect gain." (99.

The following is its first quatrain:

Youth is a bubble on the water; wealth's plenitude
Is as long waves that roll on its surface;
This well-knit frame is writing traced on the water. My friends,
Why bow we not within the courts of Him, our Lord?" (1.)

The idea, that man should not survive the loss of his honour, is expressed in:

"If any would cherish sweet life, having incurred the loss of strength and honour, let them cherish it; if only they can be sure of immunity even for a little while from death!" (41.)

"However many subjects learning may be conversant with, if there be not understanding to employ it in the right place. it is profitless! Tho' thus employed, if *power of speech* be wanting, what good is it? If this too be present, *it is as if a golden flower were to possess fragrance also.*" (5.)

(To be continued)